REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-23 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 14 are amended. Claims 24 and 25 are added. Support for the amendments and additions may be found in the Specification as originally filed at paragraph 52. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Rofrano. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,035,283). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rofrano is generally directed toward a virtual sales person for electronic catalogue. In particular, the examiner relies on Rofrano to teach an expert system that queries a shopper about the product, about themselves (e.g., their priorities relating to quality versus compatibility), and how they plan to use a product (indoor versus outdoor operation), and uses a relational database that relates answers to product features to select products. Since the answers are related to questions about users and/or intended uses of products, the Examiner identifies these relationships as qualitative attributes. However, Rofrano does not teach a projects database containing a data structure of projects with at least one of recommended products, or recommended product classes and attribute combinations, wherein the questions posed comprise questions about at least one project for which the product should be suitable, and the selections made by the system are dependent upon projects for which products are suitable.

Applicants' claimed invention is generally directed to a networked product selection system. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a product selection system having a projects database containing a data structure of projects with at least one of recommended products, or recommended product classes and attribute combinations, wherein the questions posed comprise questions about at least one project for which the product should be suitable, and the selections made by the system are dependent upon projects for which products are suitable. For example, independent claims 1 and 14 as amended recite "a projects database containing a data structure of projects with at least one of recommended products, or recommended product classes and attribute combinations, wherein the questions posed comprise questions about ... at least one project for which the product should be suitable, and the selections made by the system are dependent upon ... projects for which products are suitable." Support for the amendments may be found in the specification as originally filed at paragraph 52. Therefore, Rofrano does not teach all of the limitations of the independent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rofrano. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,035,283) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of the differences between Applicants claimed invention and Rofrano, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to Remarks detailed above with respect to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. These differences are significant.

Microsoft Computer Dictionary is generally directed toward computers. In particular, the Examiner relies on Microsoft Computer Dictionary to teach a distributed database, and making a backup as a duplicate copy of data. However, Microsoft Computer Dictionary does not teach a projects database containing a data structure of projects with at least one of recommended products, or recommended product classes and attribute combinations, wherein the questions posed comprise questions about at least one project for which the product should be suitable, and the selections made by the system are dependent upon projects for which products are suitable.

Applicants' claimed invention is generally directed to a networked product selection system. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a product selection system having a projects database containing a data structure of projects with at least one of recommended products, or recommended product classes and attribute combinations, wherein the questions posed comprise questions about at least one project for which the product should be suitable, and the selections made by the system are dependent upon projects for which products are suitable. For example, independent claims 1 and 14 as amended recite "a projects database containing a data structure of projects with at least one of recommended products, or recommended product classes and attribute combinations, wherein the questions posed comprise questions about ... at least one project for which the product should be suitable, and the selections made by the system are dependent upon ... projects for which products are

suitable." Support for the amendments may be found in the specification as originally filed at paragraph 52. Therefore, neither Rofrano nor Microsoft Computer Dictionary teach all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(abase don their dependence from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _May 23, 2005_

By: _____
Jennifer S. Brooks
Reg. No. 51,501
Christopher M. Brock
Reg. No. 27313

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[CMB/JSB/kup]